# Franchise Tax Board ANALYSIS OF AMENDED BILL

Franchise Tax Board	175 1010	OI AMEND	LD DILL	
Author: Bowen	Analyst:	Gloria McCon	nell Bill I	Number: SB 157
See Legislative Related Bills: History	_ Telephone	: <u>845-4336</u>	Amended Date:	07/02/03
	Attorney:	Patrick Kusia	k Spon	sor:
SUBJECT: Streamlined Sales Tax Project/Board Of Governance/Includes One Member Of Franchise Tax Board				
SUMMARY				
Under this bill, one member of the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) would serve on the Board of Governance (Board), which would represent California on the multi-state sales and use tax project.				
SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS				
These July 2, 2003, amendments identify the members of the Board.				
This is FTB's first analysis of this bill.				
PURPOSE OF THE BILL				
According to the author's office, the intent of this bill is to enable California to have a voice in the development of the multi-state sales and use tax project.				
EFFECTIVE/OPERATIVE DATE				
This bill is effective and operative January 1, 2004.				
POSITION				
Pending.				
ANALYSIS				
STATE LAW				
The Board of Equalization (BOE) administers the Sales and Use Tax law.				
The FTB administers the Personal Income and Corporation Tax Laws.				
Unless otherwise provided, actions of BOE and FTB must take place in meetings open to the public, which would include the selection of a BOE and FTB member for purposes of serving on the Board created by this bill.				
Board Position: S NA	N	NP	Department Director	Date
SA O		NAR PENDING	Gerald H. Goldberg	7/16/03

Senate Bill 157 (Bowen) Amended July 2, 2003 Page 2

## **CURRENT PRACTICE**

BOE voted on March 26, 2003, to be a non-voting participant in the multi-state sales and use tax project (Streamlined Sales Tax Project (SSTP)).

## THIS BILL

This bill would create the California Streamlined Sales Tax Project, under the Sales and Use Tax Law. This bill would allow California to be a voting participant of the multi-state SSTP, in accordance with its Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement, as described under "Background."

For purposes of this chapter, definitions are provided as follows:

"Agreement" means the Streamlined Sales and Used Tax Agreement.

"Board" means the board of governance, as defined in the act, or board's designee.

"Certified automated system" means software certified jointly by the states that are signatories to the agreement to calculate the tax imposed by each jurisdiction on a transaction, determine the amount of tax to remit to the appropriate state, and maintain a record of the transaction.

"Purchaser" means any person to whom a sale of tangible personal property is made or to whom a service is provided.

The Board would be created and would consist of:

- One member of the Senate chosen by the Senate Committee on Rules,
- One member of the Assembly chosen by the Speaker of the Assembly,
- One member of the State BOE,
- One member of the FTB, and
- One member of the Governor's Department of Finance.

The Board would be authorized to represent California in all meetings with those states that are also authorized by statute to enter into the agreement. The Board would be required to vote on behalf of California and to represent the position of California in all matters relating to the adoption of or amendments to the agreement. Before the Board could enter into the agreement, each state must abide by certain requirements of the agreement, as specified in the bill.

## IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

No implementation considerations are identified.

Senate Bill 157 (Bowen) Amended July 2, 2003 Page 3

## TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- "Certified automated system" and "purchaser" are defined, but are not used in this bill.
- In the definition of "board:
  - 1. "board of governance" should be capitalized.
  - 2. "act" should be changed to "chapter" since the word "Act" has been eliminated from the common title "Streamlined Sales Tax Project."
- Conceivably a BOE or FTB member could serve on the Board of Governance before being "officially" selected at a open meeting. In this event, it is uncertain whether any votes that may be cast would be subject to challenge.
- There is the potential for multiple representations by members of the Board of Governance:
  - 1. The Controller is a member of both the FTB and BOE, therefore, could be the member selected by both FTB and BOE for the Board of Governance.
  - 2. The Director of the Department of Finance is a member of the FTB and could be selected by the FTB for the Board of Governance, but that person or another person from the Department of Finance also would be a member of the Board of Governance.
- It is unclear whether the Governor's Department of Finance has "members," one of which would serve on the Board of Governance under this bill.

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In 2000, SB 1949 (Costa, et al.), which would have directed the Governor or his representative to participate in discussions with other states on sales and use tax simplification and uniformity, was vetoed by the Governor as unnecessary, because California already participates in other national forums where sale and use tax issues are discussed. The forums identified were the Multi-state Tax Commission, the National Governor's Association, and the Advisory Commission on Electronic Commerce.

## PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The multi-state SSTP began in early 2000 as an initiative by state governments with input from local governments and the private sector to simplify and modernize sales and use tax administration for all types of commerce. This simplified system is intended to incorporate uniform definitions within tax bases, simplified audit and administrative procedures, and emerging technologies to substantially reduce the burdens of tax collection. The focus of the project is to improve sales and use tax collection and administration systems for all involved: retailers, remote sellers, and government.

There are currently 39 states participating in the multi-state SSTP, of which three are non-voting participants. To be a voting multi-state SSTP participant, the state must support the multi-state SSTP mission, and the state must commit to the participation through legislation or other high level endorsement.

Senate Bill 157 (Bowen) Amended July 2, 2003 Page 4

#### OTHER STATES' INFORMATION

The states reviewed were *Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota,* and *New York.*These states were selected due to their similarities to California's economy, business entity types, and tax laws. *Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnnesota* and *Michigan* participates in the multi-state SSTP. *New York* is in the process of enacting legislation enabling it to participate in the multi-state SSTP.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

## **Departmental Costs**

This bill would not affect departmental costs.

## **ECONOMIC IMPACT**

## Revenue Estimate

This bill would have no identifiable revenue impact under the Personal Income and Corporation Tax Laws. Staff defers to the BOE on the revenue impact to sales and use tax.

## LEGISLATIVE STAFF CONTACT

Gloria McConnell Brian Putler

Franchise Tax Board Franchise Tax Board

845-4336 845-6333

gloria.mcconnell@ftb.ca.gov brian.putler@ftb.ca.gov